



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,619	11/20/2003	John P. Daley	0942.3750002	6354
26111	7590	11/16/2006	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			KIM, TAEYOON	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1651	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,619	DALEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Taeyoon Kim	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 55, 61 and 76-97 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 55,61 and 76-97 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/9/04, 9/21/04, 4/5/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 55, 61 and 76-97 are pending.

Applicant is advised that the current application has been assigned to a new art unit (AU 1651).

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II (claims 59, 60, 62, 63, 69-73 and 76-90) in the reply filed on Aug. 28, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the search of the subject matter of the claims of Group II would be substantially coextensive with a search of the subject matter of Group I (claim 55) and Group III (claim 61) because the subject matter of Groups I, II, and III all relate to CD34+ hematopoietic cells and the expansion of CD34+ hematopoietic cells. This is found persuasive and therefore claims 55 and 61 are rejoined with claims 76-97.

Claims 56-60 and 62-75 have been canceled. Claims 55, 61 and 76-97 are pending and have been considered on the merits.

Claim Objections

Claim 61 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 61 is dependent on the claim which is not preceding the current claim.

A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any **preceding** independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 77 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant generically claims a method employing "derivatives" of N-acetyl-L-cysteine. However the specification does not contain an adequate description for the entire scope of this limitation and thus the claims. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or

chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. See Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,733,746. This is a double patenting rejection.

Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 27 and 33 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,733,746. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct

from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 61, 76-78 and 80-97 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6, 33-38 and 46-48 of U.S. Patent No. 6,733,746. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although the claims of the current application have a slightly different scope of invention compared to the claims of '746 patent, for example, the limitation disclosed in the claims of the '746 patent such as the ingredients of the serum-free medium being present at a concentration that supports the expansion of CD34⁺ hematopoietic cells is not claimed in the current application, both the claims of the current application and the claims of the '746 patent are drawn to a same method of expanding recombinant CD34⁺ hematopoietic cells with the same steps. Therefore, the claims of '746 patent renders the claims of the current application obvious. Moreover, the ingredients of the serum-free medium of the '746 patent are identical to those of the current application, and thus the claims of '746 patent (claims 33-38) anticipate the claim of the current application (claim 79), and therefore renders

obvious. The claims of '746 patent do not disclose the temperature of culture condition, duration of culturing the cells or the cells being human cells. However, it would have been obvious for the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to routinely practice mammalian cell culture including human cells at the temperature of 37°C, and several days to obtain sufficient number of cells. Therefore, the claims of '746 patent render the claims of the current application obvious.

Claim 81 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 33-38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,733,746 in view of Wilson et al. (US 5,817,773; IDS ref. AA3). The method of culturing CD34 hematopoietic cells in serum free medium is claimed in both '746 patent and the claims of the current application. The claims of the '746 patent do not disclose the limitation of the serum-free medium comprising a cytokine or a growth factor. Wilson et al. teach the synergistic effect of a cytokine such as GM-CSF and a growth factor such as bFGF in CD34+ hematopoietic stem cells (see column 25 and 26, Fig. 16). It would therefore have been obvious for the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a cytokine and/or a growth factor in the method claimed in the '746 patent, since Wilson et al. teach the presence of GM-CSF and bFGF synergistically increase proliferation of CD34+ cells. Therefore, the claims of the '746 patent in view of Wilson et al. render the claimed invention of the current application obvious.

Art Unit: 1651

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taeyoon Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-9041. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm ET (Mon-Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Taeyoon Kim
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1651



Leon B. Lankford, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651